UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,351	11/26/2003	Wayne D. Comper	62386-043	6164
7590 01/22/2008 McDermott, Will & Emery 600 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096			EXAMINER	
			CHEN, STACY BROWN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	01/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
. Office Action Summary		Application No.					
		10/721,351	COMPER, WAYNE D.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
	·	Stacy B. Chen	1648				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)[\]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 No</u>	ovember 2007					
		action is non-final.					
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dienositi		. pario quajio, 1000 0.5. 11, 10	0.0.210.				
•	Disposition of Claims						
	Claim(s) 22,25-27,29 and 31-38 is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	☐ Claim(s) 22,25-27,29 and 31-38 is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) <u> </u>	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers		·				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)🛛	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 November 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice 3) Inform	e(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa	e				

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's submission filed on November 2, 2007 has been entered. Claims 22, 25-27,
 and 31-38 remain pending and under examination.

Response to Amendment

2. The rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22, 25-27, 29 and 31-38 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but fail to persuade. Applicant points to several references in the specification for support of the "method of screening kidney function for the ability to fragment protein in a patient". Applicant points to page 1, paragraph 3, page 7, paragraph 34, page 14, paragraph 77, page 16, paragraph 85, and page 25, paragraph 136.

Art Unit: 1648

In response, the Office has carefully reviewed these passages from the specification as well as the claimed subject matter, and maintains its position that the specification does not appear to adequately provide support for the preamble of the claims. It is clear from the specification that fragmentation profiles are generated, and that decreased protein fragmentation indicates kidney disease. However, it does not appear that Applicant intended to screen kidney function for decrease activity without reference to kidney disease. The problem is that the screening of kidney function itself it not the invention in and of itself, rather, the invention is the correlation of that decreased function with kidney disease. Previously, the claims were drawn to a method of diagnosing renal disease or a condition associated with renal disease/complications by performing the instantly claimed method steps. Now, Applicant is claiming an intermediate step as an invention, when it was only ever a link to diagnosing renal disease. While the steps in the instant methods are supported in the specification, the overall purpose of the steps (screening kidney function for the ability to fragment protein) does not appear to have been contemplated at the time of filing.

The instant invention is concerned with the fragmentation profiles of proteins as they relate to intact modified protein. It is the intact modified protein (initially identifiable by HPLC) that renders the method of monitoring the fragmentation profile novel according to the specification. The phrase "screening kidney function for the ability to fragment protein" is of a broader scope than the initial intent of the specification, which is to monitor intact modified protein via fragmentation profiles. The specification is not directed to overall, general screening of kidney function for the ability to fragment protein without a step of correlating that

Art Unit: 1648

determination (a decrease in protein fragmentation) with renal disease. Therefore, the claims are rejected for reciting new matter that was not supported in the specification as originally filed.

Conclusion

4. No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

Application/Control Number: 10/721,351

Art Unit: 1648

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

examiner should be directed to Stacy B. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-0896. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-4:30), alternate Fridays off,. If attempts to

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can

be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application

or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/Stacy B. Chen/ 1-17-2008 Primary Examiner, TC1600 Page 5